



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,280	03/29/2004	Seung-Min Park	678-1280 (P11401)	2265
28249	7590	11/24/2004	EXAMINER	
DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP 333 EARLE OVINGTON BLVD. UNIONDALE, NY 11553			BROUSSARD, COREY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2835	

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/812,280

Applicant(s)

PARK ET AL.

Examiner

Corey M. Broussard

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 March 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "first opening" and "second opening" must be shown or the features canceled from the claims. No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: The use of the word "rotatably" is grammatically incorrect. The term should be "rotatable". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. Details of the optical alignment system and its function are critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). The optical alignment system is the most distinguishing feature of the claimed invention, but neither the specification nor the claims define what is being aligned, how aligning transmits data, or how a laser facilitates this transmittal. The specification seems to imply that the optical system is a projector for displaying images on a separate screen, but fails to enable one skilled in the art as to how the components of such a device could be integrated in the device disclosed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickie (US 2003/0041206) in view of Dials et al (PN 6,000,768). With respect to claim 1, Dickie teaches a cradle for a portable terminal comprising: a desk-top housing (104); a cradle housing including a rear portion (300) where the rear portion is rotatable about a hinge axis (see Fig. 3, 300 can hinge about either spring 302) so that the rear portion pops in and out of the desk-top housing, and an optical alignment system insofar as it can be understood (310, paragraph [0024] lines 5-9 suggest an IR transceiver) mounted at a predetermined position of the desk-top housing and emitting a beam in a predetermined direction. Dickie lacks a cradle housing with lateral portions or an optical alignment system mounted on the cradle housing. Dials teaches a desk-top housing (11) having a cradle housing (13) with an upper portion (front face of 13, see Fig. 1), and a front portion (top side of 13) and a pair of lateral portions (sides of 13) which form a closed wall. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the portable terminal cradle of Dickie with the hinged housing of Dials to obtain a protective cradle that covers and protects the terminal when cradled. It has been held that a rearrangement of parts of prior art without affecting the operation of a device is an obvious design choice. In re Japikse, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to place the optical

alignment system of Dickie anywhere to facilitate communication with the portable terminal.

7. With respect to claim 3, Dickie teaches the desk-top housing further comprises a display unit (110), at least one key disposed adjacent to the display unit (114) and at least one lamp (124) disposed adjacent to the key and display unit, the display unit, the key and the lamp being mounted at a front portion of the desk-top housing.

8. With respect to claim 4, Dickie as modified by Dials teaches the device as applied to claim 1 above, and that the portable terminal is restrained by the closed wall of the front and both lateral portions of the cradle housing.

9. With respect to claims 2 and 5, Dickie teaches that the optical alignment system (310) is a IR transceiver. It is known in the art that the diodes utilized in IR transceivers project laser beams. Dickie lacks the optical system mounted on the rear portion to emit a beam in a rearward direction. It has been held that a rearrangement of parts of prior art without affecting the operation of a device is an obvious design choice. In re Japikse, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950). It would have been obvious to a person in ordinary skill in the art to mount the optical alignment system anywhere to facilitate communication with the portable terminal.

10. With respect to claim 6, it is inherent in the device as applied to claim 1 above that the optical alignment system mounted anywhere on the cradle housing would pop in and out of the desk-top housing according to the rotating direction of the cradle housing.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Corey M. Broussard whose telephone number is 571 272 2799. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached on 571 272 2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

cmb


LYNN FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800